

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/080,100	BARBAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Terry A. McKelvey	1636	

All Participants:

Status of Application: After FAOM

(1) Terry A. McKelvey.

(3) _____.

(2) Michael McCarthy.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 February 2005 (week of)

Time: 5:30 PM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
 N/A

Claims discussed:
 1-6

Prior art documents discussed:
 N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
 See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 TERRY MCKELVEY
 PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The two ways that prosecution could occur was discussed: permission for examiner's amendment limiting allowable claims to SEQ ID NO:46 and sending an Ex Parte Quayle action. The nature of the invention was also discussed and in the interests of compact prosecution, a potential compromise between an increased amount of the applicant's inventions searched (up to 10 total sequences if the searches could be done without serious burden and applicant agreed to an examiner's amendment limiting the claims to those sequences minus any sequences that result in the claimed invention reading on the prior art) and examiner burden was discussed. The applicant did not agree to the proposed examiner's amendment limiting the claims to up to 10 sequences minus any of the sequences that read on the prior art identified in a search of those sequences.